

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendment and the discussion that follows.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-6 and 9-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramey, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,298,128), and Claims 7 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey et al., in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0138296 (Holmes, Jr.). Claims 8 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey et al. in view of Johnson, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,813,349). Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 13 have been amended. A petition for two months extension of time with the required fee has also been filed herewith. After a careful review of the claims and references, it is believed that the claims are in allowable form and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.


Claims 1-6 and 9-18 have been rejected as being anticipated by Ramey et al., which concerns a system and method for message communications. The cited portion of Ramey et al. (Col. 4, lines 59-64; Col. 5, lines 16-22 and 50-51) describes digitizing and storing of a message left by a caller (i.e., an answering machine function). Caller I.D., what is data not voice, is also stored along with time and date. While digitizing of voice is described, packetizing and voice to text speech recognition is not. Further, Ramey et al. does not describe a method suitable for an automatic calls distribution system with accumulation of stored information to be searched, for use in post-processing reporting, etc., or for key word searches. (See Application, p. 14, Para. 50).

Claim 1 as amended calls for an automatic call distribution system, and all independent claims 1, 9, and 13 calls for converting the voice contact information into digitized, packetized

form. Ramey et al. does not teach searching the converted voice data, but rather searches information in a correspondent database such as Fig. 2 which stores caller I.D. information and other attributes related to the telephone (see. Col. 5, lines 31-35) but not digitized, packetized voice data. Thus, Ramey does not teach converting voice contact information into digitized, packetized form nor does Ramey teach searching the digitized, packetized voice data as claimed. Accordingly, Claims 1, 9 and 13, as amended are believed to be distinguishable over Ramey. Further, none of the other cited references teach the claimed combination, and therefore, Claims 1, 9 and 13 are believed to be neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the cited references. In addition claims 2-8, 10-12 and 14-20 are dependent upon now allowable Claims 1, 9 and 13, and therefore are also believed to be in allowable form.

As discussed above, claims 1-20 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by any combination of the cited references. Therefore, allowance of claims 1-20 is believed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
James A. Scheer, Esq.
Registration No. 29,434

Dated: January 12, 2006
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 655-1500
Facsimile: (312) 655-1501